



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of man shall give unto you; *for him hath God the Father sealed* (τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ θεός). The use of σφραγίζω III., 33 does not surprise us; it signifies there, *to confirm*, but the train of thought which has led the Lord to employ here the verb σφραγίζω is difficult to understand.

One of my Jewish friends who studies very earnestly our New Testament, Mr. Moses Reichersohn at Wilna, known as the author of two grammatical works, suggested to me in reference to this difficulty an idea which I think ought not to be suppressed. My Hebrew translation has מִזֶּה נִרְאָה כִּי הִנַּחְתָּם בַּחֹתֶם הָאֵב הוּא כִּי בֹ חֶתֶם חוֹתְמוֹ אָבִיו הָאֱלֹהִים. Hereto Mr. Reichersohn in one of his letters remarks: מִזֶּה נִרְאָה כִּי הִנַּחְתָּם בַּחֹתֶם הָאֵב הוּא כִּי בֹ חֶתֶם חוֹתְמוֹ אָבִיו הָאֱלֹהִים. הֵבֵן אֵךְ צִרִיךְ עֵיוֹן כִּי יִתֵּבֵן אֲשֶׁר אֹלִי בְּגוֹף הַסֶּפֶר הָרִאשׁוֹן הִיָּה הַחֹתֶם מוֹסֵב עַל הַלֶּחֶם וְכֵן נִקְרָא הָאֹפֶה בְּלִשׁוֹן הַתְּלִמּוֹד בְּשֵׁם נִחְתָּם וְנִלְ מוֹסֵב עַל הַלֶּחֶם מִנִּיחַ חוֹתְמוֹ לִפִּי שֶׁהוּא מִנִּיחַ חוֹתְמוֹ עַל הַכֶּכֶר that is, "thence it seems that the sealed by the seal of the Father is the Son, but it ought to be queried whether perhaps in the original text the seal referred to the meat (bread), for in the Talmudic language the baker bears the name נִחְתָּם, and it seems to me (וְנִרְאָה לִי = וְנִלְ) that he is named thus because he impresses his seal on the bread." Besides he calls to mind that the consecrated wafers in the Lord's supper are wont to be marked with certain signs as INRI (the inscription over the cross).

The supposition that the pronoun *him* (αὐτόν) originally did not relate to the speaker, but to the meat (מֵאֵכָל), is quite unnecessary. The Lord compares himself to a heavenly meat and as such he is, as he says, sealed by the Father. Really it is conceivable that he, saying so, has in mind the custom of bakers which is expressed by their name, or of which their name is certainly a reminder.

THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF AMOS.

BY TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York City.

As long ago as the days of Jerome this prophet was spoken of as *imperitum sermone, sed non scientia*. An echo of this thoughtless utterance is found in a recent clever American volume,* the author of which regards Amos as one "who had not received the slightest education." The assertion in either case is due to a complete misconception of the purport of the prophet's account of himself (vii. 14). Amaziah the priest, offended at the severe utterances of Amos against Israel, bade him return to Judah and there in safety earn his

* The Outermost Rim and Beyond, by Ch. Van Norden.

livelihood by discharging prophetic functions. To this Amos answered, "I was no prophet neither was I a prophet's son, but I was a herdsman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: and the Lord took me from behind the flock and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophecy to my people Israel." Obviously there is here no reference to the degree or the kind of the prophet's culture. The point of the statement is that Amos was neither by profession nor by descent a prophet, but a man of secular pursuits from which he was diverted only by the immediate call of Jehovah. He was therefore in no sense dependent upon the prophetic office for his support, and the suggestion of Amaziah had no bearing in his case. This is all that is meant by Amos's mention of his original occupation. And that that occupation did not interfere with a certain intellectual culture is shown by the parallel case of David. He was taken from following the flocks of his father when called to the service of Saul, nor are we told of any educational opportunities which he enjoyed. Yet he became the sweet singer of Israel and in early life put together such immortal poems as "O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name etc.," "The LORD is my shepherd etc." What David's literary advantages may have been it is not easy to say, but one may fairly infer that the same, whatever they were, were open to the herdsman of Tekoah, who therefore could not have been an uneducated man.

And this view is confirmed by the entire character of his utterances. None of them indicate the crudeness or infelicity of an unlettered man. On the contrary there is much which shows that the author was concerned not only about his thought, but about the precise and forcible expression of it. A signal instance is found in the opening chapters which display a rhetoric as careful and finished as is to be found anywhere else in the Old Testament. First, the prophet announces the source and the object of his inspiration, the former coming from the seat of the Theocracy, Jerusalem, and the latter being the Northern kingdom, represented by its bold headland, Carmel. Jehovah has a message of wrath against Israel. But mark the deliberate way in which this utterance is approached. At first view, Amos seems to go far away from his aim; but it is only in appearance. He takes up in turn seven of the surrounding peoples, Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab and Judah, and in a series of predictions, all constructed after the same pattern, sets forth their sins and their doom. Each has been guilty of three transgressions and of four, i. e., an indefinite number, and in the case of each fire is to fall upon its wall and devour its palaces. But this is only to introduce the case of Israel. In nature we see the lightning's flash and then hear the roar in the skies, but

here we have the reverberation of the thunder before the bolt falls. It tells us that sin is everywhere the object of God's wrath, but especially when it is found among his own people. And the solemn rhythmical prelude respecting the judgment upon the heathen and Judah gives a fearful impressiveness to the lengthened denunciation against Israel. It was not an unskilled writer that conceived this highly wrought picture.

So the three successive chapters that follow this weighty introduction, each beginning with a "Hear this word," are careful enlargements of a single portion of the one great theme, and show the hand of a man who knew just what he wanted to say and chose the most fitting form to say it. See, for example, the succession of striking metaphors in chap. iii. by which the authority of the prophet is exhibited; and the list of divine judgments in chap. iv., each one in turn followed by the solemn refrain, "Yet ye have not returned unto me, said the Lord," and the whole wound up with the lofty description of Jehovah, God of hosts, as he that formeth the mountains and createth the wind and declareth unto man what is his thought. Surely if untaught herdsmen of Judah could talk and write after this fashion, they were different from all other herdsmen of whom we have knowledge.

The same features appear in the series of brief symbolic visions mentioned in the last three chapters. First, is the representation of Israel's overthrow under the form of an invasion of grasshoppers cutting off the entire second crop of the grass and therefore leaving no hope of revival, but at the prophet's intercession the destruction is averted. Secondly, devouring fire seizes all the sea and a part of the land, but once more Amos intercedes and the decree is revoked. Thirdly, Jehovah is seen standing upon a wall with a plumb-line in his hand, not however to complete the building but to see that it is systematically and thoroughly destroyed. The intercession is not repeated, but the priest of Bethel seeks to frighten the prophet away. The only result of this interposition is a denunciation of the priest's own doom, and a new symbol of the people's ruin, viz., a basket of summer fruit, the Hebrew word for which has also the sense of *end*, and the obvious meaning of the vision is that there is an end once for all to Israel. The sun is to go down at noon, feasts are turned into mourning and songs into lamentations, and the worshippers of idols shall fall never again to rise. To complete the picture of this final remediless overthrow, a concluding vision is set forth in the opening of the ninth chapter. The prophet sees the Lord standing upon the altar, not to welcome the worshippers, but here in the holy place itself to give the signal of destruction and send the whole edifice crashing upon the heads of the

people. So complete is the ruin that none escape. Neither heaven above nor Sheol beneath, neither the top of Carmel nor the bottom of the sea, shall prove a refuge for the fugitive. The land itself is submerged like Egypt, and Israel perishes just as if they were uncircumcised heathen.

But the prophecy closes with a bright vision of hope. A day will come when the fallen tabernacle shall be restored and all its breaches repaired. The blessing shall take in not only the covenant people, but all the heathen upon whom God's name is called. The kingdom which is to fall to pieces like a dismantled hut, will be re-established as in the splendid days of David's reign, but will far surpass even his extended boundaries since it will take possession of all the nations. Then all nature shall smile. The plowing lasts unto the harvest and the vintage to the sowing time. The mountains drop new wine and the hills melt into streams of milk. And upon the whole is placed the stamp of perpetuity: "they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given them."

It is undoubtedly true that Amos's language and imagery indicate a country life on his part but not in the sense of rudeness for, as Ewald justly says, his rustic images are stamped with originality and vividness. The country seat and the vineyard, the cart full of sheaves, the plowing among rocks, the devastation of the locust, the sadness of a drought, were suggestions from his own personal observation. The same may be said of his references to wild animals, the roar of the lion, the rescue of a mere fragment of his victims, the biting of a serpent, the snaring of birds and the encounter of a bear, all reminiscences of what he had seen or felt. Still more evident is this in his descriptions of the mighty workings of God. Here he dwells by preference upon celestial phenomena, since the contemplation of the starry heavens belongs characteristically to a shepherd living in the open air. Jehovah represents himself to him as the former of the mountains and the creator of the wind, the maker of the Seven Stars and Orion, the Being who turns the shadow of death into morning, or on the other hand causes the sun to go down at noon and darkens the earth in clear day. Every where nature appears as the creature of God, absolutely subject to his will, and subservient to his purposes. If the Ephraimites explained their worship of the golden calf as terminating not in the mere image but in the reproductive power of nature as thus symbolized, he exalted the Jehovah as the God of hosts, who controls heaven above and Sheol beneath as well as all that lies between them, who touches the earth and it melts, who gives or withholds the rain, who sends and recalls the destructive flood, and who

therefore admits of no rivalry either with graven images or that which they symbolize. If Amos therefore moved only in the simple circle of country life, he did it to purpose, and made most effective use of all natural phenomena, common or uncommon, small or great.

In conclusion, Dr. Pusey justly suggests the wondrous rigor of the sudden summons (iv., 12): "Because I will do *this* unto thee [the silence as to what *this* is, is more thrilling than words], prepare to meet thy God, O Israel!" Or the extreme pathos with which the picture of the luxurious rich is closed (vi., 6) when having said how they heaped luxuries one upon another, he ends with what they did *not* do: "they are not grieved for the afflictions of Joseph."

THE BATTLE ADDRESS OF ABIJAH.

2 Chronicles XIII., 4—12.

BY REV. JAMES L. BIGGER, M. A., B. D.,

Lisburn, Ireland.

Is this speech of Abijah an historical fiction? Are the references to Levitical ordinances as gross anachronisms as Shakspeare's "shipman's card" or "cannon" in the time of Macbeth? Is it as impossible that the Jewish king could have spoken as is represented, as it is that the words of the play could have been uttered in the days of the Scottish monarch?

These questions are suggested by the following note in Dr. Robertson Smith's "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," p. 421. "The speeches in Chronicles are not literal reports. They are freely composed without strict reference to the exact historical situation" . . . "Thus in Abijah's speech on the field of battle (2 Chron. XIII., 4 sq.) the king is made to say that Jeroboam's [rebellion took place when Rehoboam was a mere lad and tender-hearted, and had not courage to withstand the rebels. The mere lad (נער) according to 1 Kings XIV., 21 was forty-one years old. Abijah then proceeds to boast of the regular temple service conducted according to Levitical law. But the service described is that of the Second Temple, for the king speaks of the golden candlestick as one of its elements. In Solomon's Temple there stood not one golden candlestick in the holy place in front of the *adyton* (רביץ, oracle, i. e., Holy of Holies) but ten (1 Kings VII., 49). Again the morning and evening burnt-offerings are mentioned. But there is a great concurrence of evidence that the evening offering was purely cereal in the First Temple, or indeed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (1 Kings XVIII., 36, *Hebrew*; 2 Kings XVI., 15; Ezra IX., 4, *Hebrew*). Compare Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, chap. 14, note 1. This speech is one of the clearest proofs that the Chronicler's descriptions of ordinances are taken from the usages of his own time."

Three arguments are here expressed or implied: 1. The word נער signifies "a mere lad," and could not under any circumstances be applied to a man forty-one years of age. 2. The golden candlestick, as distinguished from ten golden candlesticks, was not an element of the Temple till the Second Temple was built. 3. No